

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**JOAQUIN VILLAREAL CASTILLO**  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
**NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, Director**  
**Texas Department of Criminal Justice**  
**Correctional Institutions Division**  
Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**No. 3-07-CV-1641-P**  
**ECF**

**RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

A Notice of Appeal has been filed in the above captioned action in which:

- ☒ the District Court has entered a final order in a habeas corpus proceeding brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.  
☐ the District Court has entered a final order in a proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the undersigned Magistrate Judge recommends as follows:

**IFP STATUS:**

- ☐ the party appealing has paid the appellate filing fee.  
☐ the party appealing should be GRANTED leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.  
☐ the party appealing is proceeding *in forma pauperis*.  
☒ the party appealing should be DENIED leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* for the following reason(s):  
☐ the Court recommends that the District Court certify, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that the appeal is not taken in good faith;  
☒ the person appealing is not a pauper;  
☐ the person appealing has not complied with the requirements of Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) as ordered by the Court. (See Notice of Deficiency and Order entered on \_\_\_\_\_).

**COA:**

- ☐ a Certificate of Appealability should be GRANTED. (See issues set forth below).  
☒ a Certificate of Appealability should be DENIED. (See reasons stated below).

**REASONS FOR DENIAL:** For the reasons stated in the Findings and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, filed on February 4, 2008, which were adopted by the District Court on March 6, 2008, the Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that reasonable jurists could conclude that the claims related to his trial and conviction are not barred by the statute of limitations. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1602, 146 L. Ed. 2d 542 (2000).

**SIGNED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2008.**

  
**PAUL D. STICKNEY**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**